Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Hamilton School, Multi-Purpose Room,
Novato, California
April 23, 2003

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Lance McMahan; Jim McAlister; Jim Ponton; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Matthew McCarron; Theresa McGarry; Richard A. Draeger; Sabrina Molinari; Joan Dekelboum; Manuel Meir; Nathan Schumacher.

RAB Members Absent:

Rich Seraydarian; Naomi Feger; Ray Zimny; Karol Raymer; Jack Walton; Marucia Britto; Thomas Hinman; Patricia Eklund.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Samantha Calamari; Jim Davies; Alan Lee, Ross Millerick, John Kaiser; Travis Williamson; John Hill.

Welcoming Remarks

Tunstall Lang welcomed the community to the April 23, 2003 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:14 p.m. She announced that the scheduled presentation on the methane evaluation by Brad Call would be incorporated into Jim McAlister's presentation.

Navy BRAC Update — Thomas Macchiarella, DODHF Novato BEC

Mr. Macchiarella gave a general orientation of the Navy properties at Hamilton.

Project Update Summary

Mr. Macchiarella summarized the topics he will cover at the RAB meeting:

- The Navy is revising the Draft FOST for the sale area.
- The Water Board approved the Navy's Response to Comments (RTCs) on the Draft Hydraulic Lift Removal Report. The Water Board and DTSC approval of this document closes the issue of soil at the gas station site.
- The Water Board has also approved the recommendations of the Annual Site Status Report and the Draft Bedrock Well Installation Plan. DTSC forwarded comments to the Navy regarding the bedrock well installation plan.
- The biosparging system operation, monitoring and reporting are being performed as described in the Final Remedial Design and Work Plan.
- The Quarterly groundwater monitoring is ongoing. The last one was conducted in February 2003 and the next will be held in May 2003.

Matthew McCarron: Where will the bedrock wells be installed?
Mr. Macchiarella: There are three proposed locations, which are basically between Main Entrance Road and State Access Road.

Mr. McCarron: Is the bedrock fractured enough where you can get water from it?

Mr. Macchiarella: We don't believe so. We have a few bedrock wells now, and based on what we know now, they probably do not have screens only in the bedrock. We want to verify that the water we are getting is actually from the bedrock and not from the greater water-bearing zone.

Mr. Macchiarella gave a status report on the Water Board Order No. 00-064. Of the nine tasks in the Order, five have been completed. Tasks 3 and 4 are now pending closeout. The Hydraulic Lift Removal Report as well as findings from other completed items will be used to complete and closeout Tasks 3 and 4. Tasks 8 and 9 consist of ongoing monitoring reports (Task 9) and occasionally updating of the groundwater monitoring plan (Task 8).

Now that the Navy has fulfilled the requirements of the Board Order, the Navy is now in the phase of implementing the Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The Water Board approved the recommendations in the Annual Site Status Report (ASSR). This year's recommendations included adjusting the sampling frequency of 12 wells, removing some analytes from the monthly biosparing monitoring program, combining monthly reports into quarterly reports, and adjusting the site status reporting frequency from quarterly to semi-annual.

Remediation System
The objective of the remediation system is to stabilize and contain the MTBE plume on Navy property and to reduce the time required to achieve the maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for all gasoline constituents in the groundwater. Biosparging means injecting air into the groundwater to increase the rate of biodegradation. Biodegradation refers to the already present "bugs" (microbes) that eat the contaminants (hydrocarbons) and convert them into carbon dioxide (CO_2) and water. After the biosparging system has reached its potential—anticipated to be approximately 1.5 years of operation—then the site will enter a monitored natural attenuation phase which is planned to reduce the contaminants to MCLs.

Mr. Macchiarella showed a map of the plume's "hot-spots" and biosparging injection points. He also showed some photos of the main equipment shed with compressors that pump air into manifolds, distribution lines, and biosparging injection wells.

The Navy officially started running the system on September 6, 2002. Rigorous monitoring of the system and wells was conducted on a daily basis for first two weeks. The measurements used to determine the effectiveness of the system are sparging flowrates, injection pressures, groundwater elevation, dissolved oxygen concentrations, and soil gas measurements (VOCs, O_2, and CO_2). The Navy also sends off canisters of

shallow soil gas to the laboratory to get very specific and detailed measurements to ensure that the system is operating at an acceptable level. The goals of the biosparging system include achieving a 95-99% reduction of dissolved MTBE concentration in performance monitoring wells, establishing a stable MTBE plume on Navy property, and achieving asymptotic levels after appropriate optimization of the biosparging system. Once the reduction of MTBE levels off, the Navy will shut down the system and monitor the plume to see if there is a rebound in the concentration levels of MTBE in the groundwater. If the rebound is significant, the Navy would turn the system back on; if the rebound is not significant, then no further use of the system would be required.

Since the monthly monitoring began last June 2002, there has been 64% decrease of average MTBE concentration (from 13,000 to 5,000 ppb) in the 7 months that the system has been in operation. This is a much greater reduction than what was projected before the system was started.

Matthew McCarron: What are the cause of the variations in the calculation?
Mr. Macchiarella: The calculation is based on a first order decay rate equation, which is a relatively simple model. The Navy used the previous site data from 1999, when the air sparging/soil vapor extraction system was in operation to predict how well the new system would work. The main purpose of the model was to estimate how long the system would need to be in operation. From that standpoint, the model seems to be working well with the actual concentration decreases.

Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST)

The Navy prepared a draft FOST for the 2-3 acre gas station site. The public review period extended from January 27 to February 25, 2003, and there was a similar regulatory agency review period. The Navy received a number of comments on the Draft FOST. In addressing the comments, the Navy adjusted the main land use restrictions for the site, which are paraphrased below:

- Dewatering of excavations is prohibited unless conducted in accordance with an approved workplan.
- New groundwater wells are prohibited and Disturbance of existing wells is prohibited, unless approved by regulatory agencies and Navy
- Construction and occupation of residential structures or daycare centers is prohibited.
- Any contaminated soil beneath Building 970, deeper than 3 feet below ground surface must be properly managed, in accordance with a pre-approved plan
- Soil below 5-ft below ground surface cannot be disturbed without an approved soil management plan.

These restrictions listed above were originally described as part of the selected remedial and Final Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

A Draft Land Use Convenant (LUC) is under development with DTSC and the RWQCB. The purpose of LUC is to grate the State (DTSC and/or RWQCB) the same enforcement rights and access provisions that are being retained by the Navy after transfer of the property.

Preston Cook: How is this different from the last meeting?
Mr. Macchiarella: In the previous list of restrictions, it stated that "any contaminated soil under Building 970 must be removed." After discussion with the regulatory agencies, it was determined that this requirement was more than what was necessary, so the Navy and regulatory agencies agreed to scale the language down to "the soil must be properly managed."

Preston Cook: Have there been any changes in removing the building from the site. We had talked about the Navy removing the building prior to transfer.
Mr. Macchiarella: The soil does not need to be removed. As I stated previously, the regulatory agencies have now issued a letter indicating that there is no further clean-up necessary with regard to soil except for the institutional controls that were proscribed in the CAP.

Preston Cook: Will the Navy remove building?
Mr. Macchiarella: The Navy has no intention of demolishing the building.

Joan Dekelboum: If someone wishes to remove the building, would there be a problem?
Mr. Macchiarella: No, just removing the building is fine. If they want to remove the building and excavate to a depth greater than 3 feet below the building, then they will need to prove to the regulatory agencies and the Navy that they are handling the soil appropriately.

Preston Cook: Who should be contacted to follow proper procedures?
Mr. Macchiarella: The regulatory agencies (DTSC and RWQCB) and possibly the Navy, depending on the situation, will provide approval of the necessary workplans.
Matthew McCarron: Would these restrictions appear on any deed for the property?
Mr. Macchiarella: Yes, the restrictions will be in the deed and will run with the land. They will also be in the covenant agreement with the State.

Matthew McCarron: Is there a database that the utilities companies check?
Theresa McGarry: The DTSC publishes on its web page a list of all sites in California that have land use restrictions. When the RWQCB signs the land use covenant, they send out a copy to all planning and building departments as a way to officially notify them. The local agencies were also previously contacted on this subject. Mr. Macchiarella: One of the tasks in the Board Order was to create a site control plan, and that was mailed to a wide array of utility companies and public works departments. The plan gives contact names and numbers for the site, as well as describing the nature of the site.

Preston Cook: Is the Navy in negotiation with the City regarding the sale of the property?
Mr. Macchiarella: Yes, there is a sale agreement in place with the City. There is an escrow date of September 2003.

Preston Cook: In real estate dealings we work with Phase I and Phase II reports, there is usually a "no further action" wording used to describe areas where no further action is needed. Would this property have a "no further action" wording when it goes to the City?
Mr. Macchiarella: For soil remediation the answer is Yes. The regulatory agencies have granted the site a "no further action" designation for soil except for institutional controls discussed previously. For groundwater, monitoring will continue pursuant to the Final CAP to reach the final clean-up goals, so there is not a "no further action" designation in place yet.

Preston Cook: Does the state of the soil and groundwater contamination at the site prevent or inhibit developers and/or bankers from developing the site?
Mr. Macchiarella: I don't know the answer to that because land development is not my line of work. However, I can say that property of this type is frequently transferred with restrictions such as these.

Future Activities
The Navy will continue biosparging operation monitoring, which includes monthly groundwater sampling and monthly soil gas sampling. The next quarterly groundwater monitoring results will be conducted in May. The Navy will attempt to finalize the bedrock well installation work plan. Now that the Navy has the regulatory approval of the response to comments and the draft hydraulic workplan, the Navy will finalize the sale-area FOST and will proceed with transfer of the property. The Navy also intends to finalize the Land Use Covenant with the State of California.

Landfill 26, GSA, and North Antenna Field - Jim McAlister, USACE

Landfill 26

Methane Monitoring Update
The purpose of the buffer trench is to separate the landfill from Hamilton Meadows. The trench goes three feet into groundwater or to bedrock, which ever was encountered first. The trench is filled with gravel and has vent pipes that are connected to a collection tube in the trench to vent methane to the ambient air. The Army also installed an impermeable barrier to prevent the methane from traveling linearly down the length of the trench. The entire length of trench and collection tube has been installed between landfill and Hamilton meadow subdivision. The first 1,000 linear feet was installed in January 2002, while the remaining 600 feet was installed in July/August 2002.

Mr. McAlister reported on the methane levels recorded since the buffer trench was installed. Mr. McAlister presented a graphic that showed contour lines representing concentration levels of methane throughout the landfill area (0%, 1%, 5% etc. up to 50%). Methane levels have decreased since the control trench was installed, and no methane appears to be migrating beyond the trench. The one area where methane continues to be detected is "Lot 30", which is depicted on the graphic as a circular cluster of contour lines, centered in one area.

In the southeastern section of the landfill, the methane levels have decreased to nearly 0% since the installation of the trench. The levels of methane in the southern area have also decreased, with GMP 30 falling to nearly 0% levels. However, locations P 29 and P30 continue to detect methane at higher levels, and the Army believes that this methane is attributable to natural organics in the area. The area historically contained the flood plains and stream beds of Pacheco Creek. There are a lot of clays, silts, and organic materials. The Army considered many different variables, such as "is the refuse in the landfill contributing to the methane?" "is there petroleum contaminated soil under the landfill cap?" and are there natural organics in the area that could be contributing?". The Army also looked at the physical characteristics of the area to see if that might be contributing. The area has a shallow depth to groundwater, so there is very little space between the bottom of the landfill cap and the groundwater for gas to be escaping.

The Army also did some radioisotope degradation testing using oxidation rates. The oxidation suggests that there is a source area, which aligns with organics detected in the soil. Also, the methane that the Army detected there does not fall within the isotope boundaries of the literature values for that type of measurement for landfill gas. There have been a number of studies done on landfills, so there is a body of literature documenting the boundaries of readings for landfill gas versus naturally occurring gas or petroleum gas. The Army also performed Carbon 13 readings of the gas and found the average age to be 300-800 years old. There are a number of different lines of evidence that, added together, point towards an organic source for the methane at Lot 30. Once the report is published, there will be more specific data regarding how these conclusions were made.

Timeframes

- Investigation Report will be completed and submitted to the agencies in May/June 2003.
- Trench Completion Report will be completed in June 2003.
- Annual Monitoring Report will be completed in May 2003.
- Comprehensive Monitoring Work Plan will be completed in June 2003.
- Monitoring of Risk Assessment probes will occur quarterly.
- Monitoring of the trench will occur quarterly.

Jim Davies: When is the risk assessment monitoring going to start?
Mr. McAlister: It will start once the regulatory agencies concur with our findings. Hopefully, this will be in June 2003.

North Antenna Field:
Ten areas were identified as areas of concern: small arms ranges, pistol range, skeet range, three burn pits, an above ground storage pits, and septic systems. The primary contaminants of concern are lead (approximately 90% of the contamination in the area), PNAs associated with incomplete burnings at the burn pits as well as the clay pigeons at the skeet range, petroleum, dioxin/furans, PCBs, and low levels of VOCs in the septic systems.

Timeframes:

- Remedial investigation- March 2003
- Risk Assessment- to the agencies by July 2003
- Feasibility study- to the agencies by September 2003
- Decision Document to the agencies following the feasibility study.
- Remedial action- October 2005

Mathew McCarron: Does this schedule coincide with the Wetlands Restoration Plan?
Mr. McAlister: Yes, it does coincide. The earliest that the Wetlands Restoration would begin in the North Antenna Field is October 2005.

Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)

Documentation and Field Work

Documentation

Main Airfield Parcel

- Record of Decisions/Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP) – This document proposes actions for all of the main airfield parcel, which includes all of the inboard areas and a 100-foot-wide strip of coastal salt marsh land owned by the Army. The document also covers the adjacent coastal salt marsh habitat. The original ROD/RAP covered only the inboard area, but it has now been revised to include the outboard strip as well.

  DTSC/RWQCB/Army have worked together on writing this document over the past several months. The 45-day public comment period is scheduled for May/June 2003. The public comment meeting is expected to be held at the end of May 2003. Local residents will be notified by mail and notification will be in the Marin IJ and the Novato Advance. This document covers all Inboard Area and Coastal Salt Marsh sites.

Matthew McCarron: Is this a Draft ROD/RAP?
Mr. Keller: Yes, it is a Draft ROD/RAP and it will have a 45-day review period to coincide with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.

Matthew McCarron: Have the comments that were originally made been incorporated in the draft document?
Mr. Keller: Yes. This document has been written jointly by DTSC, RWQCB, and the Army. The people who commented originally will be contacted in writing to explain how their comments were addressed.

Tunstall Lang: Is the Public Scoping meeting next Thursday, May 1?
Mr. Keller: Yes, this meeting is for the CEQA document and it will be held at the Humane Society.

- Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) – The document has been drafted and has been through Army legal review. It is now ready for regulatory review. The 30-day public comment period is also expected to begin in May. The process is a little different, in that Early Transfer documents have to be signed by the Governor.
- Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) – This document will be updated to support the public comment period of the FOSET in May 2003. The EBS is one of the primary reference documents for the FOSET. It provides a snapshot of the environmental condition of the property, describing the different sites, where they are located, what condition they are in, and what is there.

Coastal Salt Marsh
- Sampling Data Report – The report was submitted for regulatory review on December 18, 2002.
- Informal comments have been received from DTSC and RWQCB. The Regional Board has stated that it will also submit formal comments. There is no formal public review period but it will be available in the BRAC office.
- Focused Feasibility Study – The study is in development and will be published to support the ROD/RAP.

Hospital Hill
The City of Novato has provided final comments on the deed to the Army. The Army is currently working on the final version of the deed for the 4-acre site. It should transferred in the very near future.

Preston Cook: Is there a way to secure the building?
Mr. Keller: There have been attempts to secure the building but there are still problems. We have boarded up doors and windows, but people tear them off. We do drive by it on a regular basis to keep an eye on it, but it is not a visible site so it is difficult. Please contact the BRAC office if there are any signs of break-in.

POL Hill
The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the approximately 7-acre site was forwarded for regulatory review to the RWQCB. The closure report for the remaining features on the site, such as an 850,000-gallon tank, was also forwarded for regulatory review. The tank had leaked petroleum down into the soil and into the bedrock beneath. The CAP recommends monitored natural attenuation over time, since there is no effective way to get the petroleum out of the cracks. Fortunately, the levels of contaminants are low so the Army will simply monitor to ensure that the petroleum does not migrate offsite. The FOST is expected to go out for regulatory review in the beginning of May 2003.

Outparcel A-4
This 4-acre site is located south of the Coast Guard hangars. A developer has agreed to purchase the property for commercial use. The property is on track for transfer in May 2003.

Next Steps NOTES

Main Airfield Parcel

- Complete the finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) based on ongoing discussions between the Army and DTSC.
- Update the EBS.
- Complete CSM sampling data report.
- Complete the CSM Feasibility Study, which will present alternatives for Remediation.
- Complete the CSM ROD/RAP which present the recommended remedial alternatives for all Inboard Area and Coastal Salt Marsh sites
- Prepare the decision document, which will document the selected remedy.
- Transfer the property.
- Determine investigation requirements for any new sites.
- Implement the remedial actions.

The Army hopes to complete transfer of the airfield parcel in September 2003. The first actions for wetland restoration could start soon thereafter.

Mathew McCarron: The next RAB meeting in June will fall in middle of four public comment periods. Can the meeting be combined with the comment period?
Mr. Keller: There will have to be separate public comment meetings because of the timing of the release of the documents.

Regulatory agencies comments

Teresa McGarry delivered the approval of the risk assessment to the Army Corps, Mr. Jim McAlister. Mr. McMahan noted that DTSC has been busy getting the RAP together as a joint effort and he is looking forward to having that document come out for public review in a month or so.
Nathan Shumacher has replaced Patricia Ryan as the Public Participation Specialist for the RWQCB.

Administrative Issues - Tunstall Lang

New Membership Update

Preston Cook thanked Joy Lanzaro for all the work she has done with the membership subcommittee. Mr. Cook reported that Karol Raymer, Thomas Hinman and Jack Walton have not responded to the contact made about their membership and have missed a significant amount of meetings. The RAB subcommittee will write them a letter thanking them for their voluntary participation.

Mr. Keller: Actually the by-laws state that missing three meetings in a row is grounds for removal. However, we are in the middle of a membership drive, so the way it would work is that the subcommittee reviews all current membership as well as additional applications that have come in, and would recommend a new roster to the full RAB for consideration. So those names you mentioned would simply not be placed on the new roster. From the Army's point of view, it would be a rubber stamp of approval of the list.

We either accept it in whole or reject it in whole, we do not object to individual members. As long as there is a diverse group showing coverage of different areas and interests, etc, that's all we're looking for.

Ms. Lang: The bylaws say that if a member hasn't come to three consecutive meetings, the RAB co-chair can ask them to resign. If we don't hear from them within one month, we can declare them off the RAB.

Mr. Cook: Six applicants have expressed interest in being a RAB member. Four people are recommended for new membership. The co-chair of the RAB will review their applications to make further recommendations.

Mr. Keller: Did you get any feedback from the potential new members regarding the best date and time for the RAB meetings?

Preston Cook: Trying to comply with everyone's schedule is complicated. At the last meeting, the RAB meetings were changed to quarterly dates. My suggestion is to leave it the way it is and ask them to conform to our schedule.

Joy Lanzaro: At the last RAB meeting, two members expressed a possible conflict with the current schedule. Those members are not here tonight to represent themselves. I recommend revisiting the schedule when we can have everyone's input.

Preston Cook: I agree.

Tunstall Lang announced that there are members that have volunteered to be on the technical committee to review the ROD/RAP. Sabrina Molinari, Mathew McCarron and Preston Cook volunteered to be on this committee. When the documents are released, the BRAC office will notify the members and provide them with copies of the documents.

Open Agenda

Mathew McCarron: This issue concerns the additional research done for the archive search report back in 2001. This is no reflection on the current regulators or the clean-up team, but I am a little disappointed because this is something that should have been done first. We spent a lot of taxpayer money on contractors doing baseline studies. They never looked at maps, they never looked at aerial photography and they are finding things now that they should have found a long time ago. We've had three or four teams come through here and we asked for this stuff from the first team.

Tunstall Lang announced that the next meeting will be held on July 16, 2003. The meeting will be held at the Hamilton School.